

Appl. No. 10/668,932
Amdt. dated September 15, 2005
Reply to office action of July 11, 2005

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on July 11, 2005. The Office Action rejected Applicant's Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-17 and 19-21 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,904,362 B2 ("Nakashima"). The Office Action rejected Applicant's Claims 7, 9, and 17 as obvious in view of combination of Nakashima and U.S. Pat. No. 6,430,502 B1 ("Pournain"). The Office Action rejected Applicant's Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 18 and 22-26 as obvious in view of Nakashima. The Office Action rejected Applicant's Claims 11, 12, 18, and 24-26 as obvious in view of combination of Nakashima and U.S. Pat. No. 6,477,459 ("Wunderlich").

With this response, Claim 17 has been amended. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the present application. Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

35 USC § 102

Independent Claim 1

Applicant's independent Claim 1 relates to a method of facilitating delivery of traffic messages. The method recites obtaining data indicating traffic conditions on a road network, for each of the traffic conditions the data provides a location description of the traffic conditions. The method further recites for each of the traffic conditions, identifying at least one broadcast service area in which traffic condition is located. Applicant's independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by Nakashima because the reference fails to disclose or suggest every claim element recited by the claim. Specifically, Nakashima does not disclose or suggest the recited limitation of identifying at least one broadcast area in which the traffic condition is located.

Nakashima discloses a system for providing route guidance to a destination, wherein an information delivery center provides route guidance to a vehicular route guidance apparatus. According to Nakashima, the information delivery center receives traffic jam information indicating a location, a date and time of occurrence (*see*, Nakashima: column 8, lines 20-40). The information delivery center uses the traffic jam information when calculating a recommended route between a present position and a

Appl. No. 10/668,932
Amdt. dated September 15, 2005
Reply to office action of July 11, 2005

destination. For example, the information delivery center avoids the location of the traffic jam when calculating a recommended route. Although Nakashima discloses receiving the location of traffic jam information, Nakashima does not disclose or suggest the limitation of identifying at least one broadcast service area in which the traffic condition is located. Rather, Nakashima merely uses the location of traffic jam information in calculating a recommended route that avoids traffic jams.

Accordingly, because Nakashima fails to disclose or suggest all of the recited claim elements, Applicant's independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by Nakashima.

Independent Claim 14

Applicant's independent Claim 14 relates to a method of facilitating delivery of traffic messages. The method recites obtaining data indicating a plurality of traffic conditions on a road network, for each of the traffic conditions the data provides a location reference code indicating a location on a road of the traffic condition. The method further recites for each of the traffic conditions, using the location reference code to identify at least one of the broadcast service areas in which the traffic condition is located. Applicant's independent Claim 14 is not anticipated by Nakashima because the reference fails to disclose or suggest every claim element recited by the claim.

Nakashima discloses a system for providing route guidance to a destination, wherein an information delivery center provides route guidance to a vehicular route guidance apparatus. According to Nakashima, the information delivery center receives traffic jam information indicating a location, a date and time of occurrence (*see*, Nakashima: column 8, lines 20-40). The information delivery center uses the traffic jam information when calculating a recommended route between a present position and a destination. Although Nakashima discloses receiving the location of traffic jam information, the information is merely used to calculate the recommended route, not to identify a broadcast area, as recited. Thus, Nakashima fails to disclose or suggest the recited limitation of using the location reference code to identify at least one broadcast area in which the traffic condition is located.

Appl. No. 10/668,932
Amdt. dated September 15, 2005
Reply to office action of July 11, 2005

Accordingly, because Nakashima fails to disclose or suggest all of the recited claim elements, Applicant's independent Claim 14 is not anticipated by Nakashima.

Independent Claim 19

Applicant's independent Claim 19 relates to a traffic message providing data indicating a traffic condition. The traffic message comprises a location reference code indicating a location on the road network of the traffic condition. The traffic message also comprises a broadcast service area code representing a broadcast service area in which the traffic condition is located. Applicant's independent Claim 19 is not anticipated by Nakashima because the reference fails to disclose or suggest every claim element recited by the claim.

As discussed above in conjunction with Applicant's independent Claims 1 and 14, Nakashima discloses a system for providing route guidance to a destination. Although Nakashima discloses receiving the location of traffic jam information, Nakashima does not disclose or suggest the limitation of providing a traffic message comprising a broadcast service area representing a broadcast service area in which the traffic condition is located. Rather, Nakashima merely uses the location of traffic jam information in calculating a recommended route that avoids traffic jams.

Accordingly, because Nakashima fails to disclose or suggest all of the recited claim elements, Applicant's independent Claim 19 is not anticipated by Nakashima.

35 USC § 103

Claims 7, 9, and 17

Pournain was introduced in the obviousness rejection for Applicant's dependent Claims 7, 9, and 17. As discussed above in conjunction with the Applicant's independent Claims 1, 14, and 19, Nakashima fails to disclose or suggest the limitation of the broadcast service area. In addition, Pournain also fails to disclose these claim elements. Rather, Pournain discloses a navigation system capable of operating in an enhanced guidance mode (see, Pournain: column 4, lines 29-31). For example, if there is a guidance ambiguity while navigating a maneuver in a route, the enhanced guidance mode temporarily modifies

Appl. No. 10/668,932
Amdt. dated September 15, 2005
Reply to office action of July 11, 2005

the filtered topological data showing the maneuver, thus removing the ambiguity. Pourmain has no disclosure relating to traffic and the broadcast service area.


Claims 2-13, 15-18 and 20-26

Applicant's dependent Claims 2-13, 15-18, and 20-26 are allowable at least for the reason that they depend upon allowable base claims. In addition, these claims include features that are not disclosed by the cited references.

Conclusion

With the present response, all the issues in the office action mailed July 11, 2005 have been addressed. Applicant submits that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. If any issues remain, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,


Jon D. Shutter
Reg. No. 41,311
Patent Counsel

NAVTEQ North America, LLC
222 Merchandise Mart Plaza Drive, Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 894-7000 x7365